



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,883	10/31/2003	Hideo Sato	29284/268	8984
7590 04/09/2004			EXAMINER	
KENYON & KENYON Suite 700			PARKER, KENNETH	
1500 K Street, 1	N.W.	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Washington, DC 20005			2871	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

DATE MAILED: 04/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					ľ				
		Apı	olication No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary		10	697,883	SATO ET AL.					
		Exa	aminer	Art Unit					
		Ker	nneth A Parker	2871					
	LING DATE of this commu	nication appears	on the cover sheet	with the correspondence add	ress				
Period for Reply			DET TO EVOIDE A	MONITH/C) FDOM					
THE MAILING [- Extensions of time in after SIX (6) MONT - If the period for replication in the second for replication in the	O STATUTORY PERIOD DATE OF THIS COMMUN may be available under the provision HS from the mailing date of this com y specified above is less than thirty y is specified above, the maximum in the set or extended period for rep by the Office later than three months adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NICATION. as of 37 CFR 1.136(a). amunication. (30) days, a reply within statutory period will app by will, by statute, cause	In no event, however, may the statutory minimum of t ly and will expire SIX (6) M the application to become	a reply be timely filed hirty (30) days will be considered timely. ONTHS from the mailing date of this com ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nmunication.				
Status									
1) Responsi	ve to communication(s) fi	led on							
· - ·	n is FINAL .	2b)⊠ This action	on is non-final.						
3) Since this	application is in condition	n for allowance e	except for formal ma	atters, prosecution as to the r	merits is				
closed in	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposition of Cla	ms								
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>:</u>	1 and 2 is/are pending in	the application.							
4a) Of the	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
5) Claim(s)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
6)⊠ Claim(s)									
7) Claim(s)	is/are objected to.								
8) Claim(s)	are subject to restr	iction and/or elec	ction requirement.						
Application Papers	5								
9) The specif	ication is objected to by t	he Examiner.							
,—	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.								
•	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
• • •	•			ng(s) is objected to. See 37 CFF	₹ 1.121(d).				
•	_		,	ed Office Action or form PTC					
Priority under 35 L	J.S.C. § 119								
12)⊠ Acknowled	dgment is made of a clain	n for foreign prior	rity under 35 U.S.C	. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a)⊠ All b)	Some * c) None of:								
	tified copies of the priorit	=""		Application No					
				en received in this National S	stage				
	olication from the Internat								
• •	ached detailed Office act			ot received.					
Attachment(s)									
1) Notice of Referen				w Summary (PTO-413)					
	erson's Patent Drawing Review psure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 (lo(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application (PTO-	152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail		JI F I O/OB/00)	6) Other:		•				

Application/Control Number: 10/697,883

Art Unit: 2871

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The language "at least one shading layer <u>in</u> said plurality of metal layers" is indefinite, as it is unclear what is meant by the language. It appears that it could mean that the metal layers can be the shading layer, in which case the limitation would have been met by any device with the metal layers themselves. It is presumed to mean "on" the layers.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Application/Control Number: 10/697,883

Art Unit: 2871

Claims 1-2 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of U.S. Patent No. 6437842.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims are broader than the patent claims, except that the shading layer in the instant invention is in between the top and bottom layer. As that limitation is seen as given explicit fruition in the claims of the previous invention, the current claims are fully met by the patent claims.

Claims 1-2 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 2of U.S. Patent No. 5461501.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims are broader than the patent claims, except that the shading layer in the instant invention is in between the top and bottom layer. As that limitation is seen as given explicit fruition in the claims of the previous invention, the current claims are fully met by the patent claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth A Parker whose telephone number is 571-272-2298. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10:30-6:00.

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 10/697,883

Art Unit: 2871

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert H. Kim can be reached on 571-272-2293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kemeth A Parker Primary Examiner Art Unit 2871